

STACKS

CONNECTICUT COLLEGE
LIBRARY
NEW LONDON, CONN.

PEQUOT CONSERVATIONIST

DEC 20 1966

NOVEMBER 1966

A Tri-Annual
Newsletter
Robert F. Kunz, Editor

Published by the
Pequot-sepos Wildlife
Sanctuary, Inc.
Mystic, Connecticut
Tel. 536-9777

DDT - A KILLER AT BAY IN CONNECTICUT

On December 1st, 1966 the fate of the Osprey (fish hawk) as a breeding species in Connecticut, the fate of thousands of other individual birds, the fate of many other animals, and possibly the fate of even some human lives, will be determined by the Connecticut State Board of Pesticide Control. Thursday morning, December 1st, at 10:00 AM the Board will hear testimony on the resolution (see page 3) presented by the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary requesting the banning of the biocide DDT in Connecticut for ground application by private applicators and by state agencies. This highly dangerous chemical poison - DDT - has already wisely been banned for aerial application in Connecticut by the Board of Pesticide Control.

One of the problems with chemical pesticides, as conservationists know, is that they do not stay where they are applied but travel by wind, by water and in animal food chains. In the case of DDT (a chlorinated hydrocarbon) the poison remains lethal for long periods (sometimes years) in the environment. DDT is already present in the mud at the bottom of lakes - in the soil of the forest - in the body tissue of animals including Man. Thus DDT sprayed in a town upstream on the Connecticut River can pollute the body of a fish living in the mouth of the Connecticut River. The tissue of the fish's body when eaten by the Osprey (fish hawk) in turn pollutes the hawk's body and, when a lethal level is reached, will kill the Osprey. More often, however, the less dramatic but much more insidious result is sterilization. There is no more effective way to eradicate a species!

(continued on page 2)

DDT (continued from page 1)

Animals at the top of food chains - such as the Osprey and Man - are highly vulnerable to toxic agents such as DDT in the environment because these agents are concentrated as they travel through the food chain.

In 1954 there were 150 Osprey nests in the area by the mouth of the Connecticut River; in 1960 - 71; in 1963 - 24; in 1964 - 15; a yearly decline of more than 30%. "Projecting this decline we should see our last nest on the Connecticut in 1970-71," stated Roger Tory Peterson, April 22, 1964.

Leading conservation organizations, such as the National Audubon Society, have expressed concern over DDT wildlife kills since 1946. President Kennedy's Presidential Scientific Advisory Committee in 1963 recommended severe restrictions on DDT. Now the Department of the Interior, the United States Forest Service (in the Department of Agriculture) and in increasing number of states have moved to restrict the use of the biocide DDT.

The time for action in Connecticut is NOW! The opportunity for you to help in the preservation of our natural heritage is at hand! The hearing on the banning of DDT is a Public Hearing - the Osprey, Connecticut's Natural Heritage and the Connecticut environment belong to all of us. Each of us can help by attending this hearing. If anyone cannot attend he or she can write and express their opinion to the State Board of Pesticide Control. We must stand and be counted.

The Hearing - December 1st, 10:00 AM in the Judiciary Hearing Room, State Capitol, Hartford, Connecticut. Hartford is less than two hours drive from the farthest point in Connecticut.

Letters - should be addressed to Mr. Brainerd T. Peck, Consultant, Connecticut Board of Pesticide Control, State Office Building, Hartford, Connecticut 06115.

* * * * *

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE BANNING OF THE CHEMICAL PESTICIDE DDT FOR COMMERCIAL GROUND APPLICATION AND FOR GROUND APPLICATION BY STATE AGENCIES

The following resolution was passed unanimously by the Board of Trustees of the Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary, Inc. of Mystic, Connecticut, on Saturday, May 7th, 1966.

WHEREAS, DDT is a proven highly toxic, persistent food-chain poison dangerous to wildlife and perhaps human life, and

WHEREAS, other less persistent and less dangerous pesticides are available as substitutes for DDT, and

WHEREAS, banning the use of DDT for commercial ground application and for ground application by state agencies will be in keeping with the recommendations of the U. S. Scientific Advisory Board Report of 1963, and

WHEREAS, positive proof exists that DDT and its metabolites accumulate in soil and water and in the bodies of members of animal food-chains including man, and

WHEREAS, positive proof of the build-up of DDT compounds and their metabolites in food-chains of the animal pyramid exists in the documented case of Clear Lake, California where DDD (usually considered milder than DDT) applied in several treatments in very dilute quantities (one part insecticide to 50 million parts of water) over an eight year period killed most of 1,000 pairs of Western Grebes after the DDD had been concentrated 265 times by water plankton, 500 times in small fishes that ate the plankton, and 80,000 times in the grebes that ate the fishes; especially notable is the fact that a die-off of grebes occurred of DDD poisoning five years after the last application of DDD and long after a time when this pesticide could be detected in the water or mud of the lake, and

WHEREAS, more than adequate proof is available that DDT and its metabolites are the primary causitive agents in the destruction of Connecticut's osprey population by its action of sterilizing the osprey eggs, and

WHEREAS, the probable extinction of the osprey as a nesting species on the Connecticut River has been predicted by 1970 by one of our nation's leading ornithologists, and

WHEREAS, the osprey is a magnificent and valuable part of the Connecticut Wildlife Heritage, and

WHEREAS, if there is still doubt in any minds regarding DDT and its metabolites as the primary causitive agents in the disastrous decline of the osprey population, we recommend that DDT be banned for custom ground application and for ground application by state agencies at this time until there is proof that DDT and its metabolites are no longer causing wildlife kills and do not threaten the extinction of the osprey in Connecticut,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the PEQUOT-SEPOS WILDLIFE SANCTUARY advocates and recommends that the Connecticut State Board of Pesticide Control ban the chemical pesticide DDT for ground application by commercial applicators and by state agencies.

Pequot-sepos Wildlife Sanctuary, Inc.

Mystic, Connecticut 06355

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
Mystic, Conn.
Permit No. 37

MADE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR COMMERCIAL USE ONLY
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR COMMERCIAL USE ONLY

adit to be addressed to Miss Hazel A. Johnson, Director of the Pequot Wildlife Sanctuary, 100 Pequot Avenue, New London, Connecticut 06320, U.S.A.

Dear Miss Johnson,
I am writing to you concerning the recent decision of the Connecticut State Game Commission to prohibit the sale of certain species of mammals and birds within the state. This decision was made on January 1, 1972, and it affects all species of mammals and birds within the state. The decision was made to protect the environment and to ensure that the state's natural resources are used in a responsible manner. I would like to express my concern about this decision and to ask for your support in fighting against it.

I am particularly concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's deer population. The deer population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of deer meat will further exacerbate this problem. The deer population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.

I am also concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's fish population. The fish population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of fish meat will further exacerbate this problem. The fish population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.

I am also concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's bird population. The bird population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of bird meat will further exacerbate this problem. The bird population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.

I am also concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's mammal population. The mammal population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of mammal meat will further exacerbate this problem. The mammal population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.

I am also concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's reptile population. The reptile population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of reptile meat will further exacerbate this problem. The reptile population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.

I am also concerned about the impact of this decision on the state's amphibian population. The amphibian population has been declining for several years, and the decision to prohibit the sale of amphibian meat will further exacerbate this problem. The amphibian population is an important part of the state's ecosystem, and its decline will have a negative impact on the environment. I would like to ask for your support in fighting against this decision.